



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

62

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,599	11/29/2001	John Joseph Rabasco	06062P USA	5231

23543 7590 01/06/2004

AIR PRODUCTS AND CHEMICALS, INC.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
7201 HAMILTON BOULEVARD
ALLENTOWN, PA 181951501

EXAMINER

SZEKELY, PETER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/997,599

Applicant(s)

RABASCO ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Szekely

Art Unit

1714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Final Rejection imposed 10/03/03 is withdrawn in view of applicants' response.
2. All rejections imposed previously are withdrawn by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
5. Claims 1-17 and 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chromecek et al. 4,655,957, Morpeth et al. 5,125,967, Backhouse et al. 5,583,091, Nakayabashi et al. 5,879,663, Zhou et al. 6,017,561 or Ghosh 6,149,927.
6. Chromecek et al. disclose polymers in column 2, lines 22-65, water-soluble salts of hexamethylene biguanides, benzalkonium chloride and their concentrations in

Art Unit: 1714

column 3, lines 36-47 and polyvinyl alcohol in the Examples. Morpeth et al. teach isothiazolinones in column 3, lines 9-24 and claim 5, polyvinyl alcohol and carboxymethyl cellulose in column 7, lines 14-15, poly (hexamethylene biguanide) in column 10, line 12 and polymer emulsions in claims 15-16. Backhouse et al. recite isothiazolinones and poly (hexamethylene biguanide) in column 5, lines 15-26, carboxymethyl cellulose and polyvinyl alcohol in column 6, lines 4-5 and polymer emulsions in column 7, line 6. Nakabyashi et al. divulge polyvinyl alcohol in column 4, lines 65-66, polymers in the paragraph overlapping columns 6 and 7 and polyhexamethylenebiguanide hydrochloride in column 12, lines 35-36. Zhou et al. reveal polymers and their concentrations in column 3, lines 29-60, poly (hexamethylene biguanide hydrochloride) and its concentration in column 4, lines 1-37 and polyvinyl alcohol and its concentration in column 4, lines 47-53. Sodium polyacrylate and polyacrylic acid are shown in the Examples. Ghosh displays n-alkyl dimethyl benzylammonium chloride, cetyltrimethylammonium chloride, didecyldimethylammonium chloride, dodecylguanide hydrochloride and poly (hexamethylene biguanide) hydrochloride in column 3, lines 45-50, isothiazolinones in column 4, lines 28-40, biocide concentrations in the paragraph overlapping columns 4 and 5, hydroxyethyl cellulose in Example 5 and adhesives and latexes in claim 9. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to select applicants' biocides from a list of equivalents. Whether the polyvinyl alcohol and the hydroxyethyl cellulose are present as protective colloids or

Art Unit: 1714

thickeners is immaterial as far as patentability is concerned, their presence is what is significant. The presence of a plasticizer is also obvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. "A polyacrylic" and "a polymethacrylic" are not polymers. Poly (meth) acrylic acid and poly (meth) acrylates are polymers.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (703) 308-2460. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Application/Control Number: 09/997,599

Page 5

Art Unit: 1714

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Szekely', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Peter Szekely
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

P.S.
12/8/03